UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,764	09/27/2005	Alexander Dardin	278069US0PCT	1825
	7590 08/28/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			VASISTH, VISHAL V	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1797		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/550,764	DARDIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	VISHAL VASISTH	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second co	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); w); eer form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed allowed by the claim(s).			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [     how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov     The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:     Claim(s) allowed:     Claim(s) objected to:     Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.     Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the attached life metion Displaying Statement(s).</li> </ul>	,	condition for allowand	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	P1 0/58/08) Paper No(s)		
/Glenn A Caldarola/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797	Vishal Vasisth 8/20/2009	)	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants amendment were done to correct mior informalities in the claims and did not change the scope of the claims. As such applicants' arguments are addressed below. Applicants argue that Mishra does not necessarily need polymers that read on formulas (I) and (II) as recited in instant claim 1. This argument is not persuasive. Mishra discloses that monomer (a) or (b) has to be present wherein monomer (a) reads on formula (I) as recited in claim1 and monomer (c) is also necessarily present which reads on formula (II) therefore meeting the claim limitation. One of ordinary skill in the art would envisage that monomer (a) and monomer (c) can be used in conjunction from the disclosure of Mishra.

Applicants also argue that Mishra prefers the use of random polymers and that the examples and polydisperity indicate this preference. This argument is also not persuasive. Mishra clearly states in column 4, lines 9-16 that the process in which the polymers of Mishra are prepared allows for block polymers.

Finally, applicants argue that MIshra does not disclose that the copolymer of the block type wherein the polar component is present in a block of at least three repeating units. The N,N-dimethylamino propyl methacrylamides and N,N-diethylamino propyl methacrylamides disclosed in Mishra can be used along with the other monomer which can be prepared to form block copolymers and one of ordianry skill in the art would envisage that the amine-based methacrylamides could also have at least 3 repeating units form the disclosure of Mishra.

/Glenn A Caldarola/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797